



81699.15001

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Daniel Pellerin

Group Art Unit: 3728

Serial No.: 09/771,416

Examiner:

Filed: January 26, 2001

Jila M. Mohandesi

For: UNIVERSAL CLEAT

Charles N. Quinn

Reg. No. 27,223

Customer No. 34,661

Fox Rothschild LLP

2000 Market Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Tel: 215-299-2135

Fax: 215-299-2150

Email: [cquinn@foxrothschild.com](mailto:cquinn@foxrothschild.com)

Deposit Account: 50-1943

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

Mail Stop Amendments  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**Introductory Comments**

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on February 2, 2005.

Applicant respectfully submits that the examiner has misapplied existing law in rejecting the instant application. Applicant has endeavored in the remarks section of this response and in the amendments to the claims, to disabuse the examiner of those erroneous impressions and understandings regarding existing law in an endeavor to place this application into form for allowance.

In light of the foregoing, applicant traverses the rejection of claims 10 through 26 made under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement and requests reconsideration thereof.

Applicant further traverses the rejection of claims 1 through 3, 8 and 10 through 18 made under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being insufficiently definite and failing to particularly point out describe, and claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, and requests reconsideration thereof.

Applicant still further traverses the rejection of claim 1 made under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. patent 1,055,229 to Rogers and requests reconsideration of that rejection.

Applicant further traverses the rejection of claims 2, 3 and 8 made under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being obvious in light of U.S. patent 1,055,229 to Rogers and requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Applicant further traverses the rejection made of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9 under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art and therefore unpatentable when considering U.S. patent 5,058,292 to Tanel in view of U.S. patent 4,590,693 to Kawashima, et al. and U.S. patent 5,943,795 to Ueda, et al. Reconsideration of this rejection is also respectfully requested.

Applicant further traverses the rejection of claims 2, 5, 8 and 9 made under 35 USC 103 on the basis of U.S. patent 5,058,292 to Tanel in view of U.S. patent 4,590,693 to Kawashima, et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 4,523,396 to Dassler and requests reconsideration.